
THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF UTAH

PAMELLA LAWRENCE,

Plaintiff,

v.

SONY PICTURES ENTERTAINMENT;
AMY PASCAL; MICHAEL LYNTON;
KAZUO HIRAI; CLINT CULPEPPER;
LEONARD VENGER; CHRIS ROCK; AMY
BAER; GARETH WIGAN; DEAN CRAIG;
CHRIS ROCK ENTERPRISES; JENNIFER
L. BROCKETT; MARY HASS; JAMES D.
NUYGEN; SONY PICTURES
ENTERTAINMENT COMPANY; and DOES
1-5000 inclusive,

Defendants.

**MEMORANDUM DECISION AND
ORDER ADOPTING [10] REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION TO DISMISS
COMPLAINT WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

Case No. 2:20-cv-00566-DBB-DAO

District Judge David Barlow

Magistrate Judge Daphne A. Oberg

The Report and Recommendation¹ issued by United States Magistrate Judge Daphne A. Oberg on June 1, 2021 recommends that the court dismiss Ms. Lawrence's case for failure to state a claim.² Ms. Lawrence was notified of her right to file any objections to the Report and Recommendation within 14 days of its service pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72.³

¹ Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 10, filed April June 1, 2021.

² *Id.* at 5.

³ *Id.*

On June 14, 2021, Ms. Lawrence filed a document entitled “Plaintiff’s Objection to Report and Recommendation [Plaintiff’s] Declaration in Support of Forged Judgment.”⁴ However, this document does not contain any intelligible arguments or objections to Magistrate Judge Oberg’s Report. The document appears to be more copies of the same documents and court pleadings previously provided to the court.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(2) provides that “a party may serve and file *specific written objections* to the proposed findings and recommendations.” The court is to determine de novo “any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to.”⁵ The court cannot find any specific or proper objections to Magistrate Judge Oberg’s report and recommendation. In one brief sentence, Ms. Lawrence states, “Plaintiff Objection: Pursuant 28 U.S. Code 144-Bias or prejudice of Judge Oberg.”⁶ However, Ms. Lawrence fails to provide any other facts or analysis supporting this allegation. Because Ms. Lawrence has not met the standards set forth in the rule, the court need not make any de novo determinations of Magistrate Judge Oberg’s report and recommendations.

Furthermore, the court notes that Ms. Lawrence’s opposition acknowledges that the case was not filed in the correct venue. She states that she erroneously “filed in the wrong court, Utah court” and gave notice to return, remove, and/or close the case.⁷ It appears Ms. Lawrence is referring to a document filed on September 21, 2020 as a motion to dismiss.⁸ This document provided that Ms. Lawrence would refile in the “correct court.”⁹ In her objection, Ms. Lawrence

⁴ ECF No. 11.

⁵ Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

⁶ ECF No. 11 at 5.

⁷ *Id.* at 6.

⁸ ECF No. 6.

⁹ *Id.* at 5.

again indicated that she filed “in the correct court” in Arizona, referencing case number CV20-01785-PHX-JJT.¹⁰ While unclear, the court reads this as indicating Ms. Lawrence made a mistake and took corrective action to file in Arizona.


Because the court is unable to find any specific objections in Ms. Lawrence’s document, and because the analysis and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge are sound, the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Oberg is adopted.

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation¹¹ is ADOPTED.
Plaintiff’s case is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

Signed June 15, 2021.

BY THE COURT



David Barlow
United States District Judge

¹⁰ ECF No. 11 at 6.

¹¹ Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 10, filed June 1, 2021.